

Poetry.

O! SINFUL SOUL!

O! weary, waiting soul!
Be patient, hopeful, bear the rod,
Put all your faith and trust in God
As you go wandering to the grave—
For God, and God alone, can save.

O! careworn, patient soul!
Ere dust shall be returned to dust,
In God, your Father, put your trust,
And love him faithful, fond and true,
He gave his Son for such as you.

O! sinful, dying soul!
Awake! Love now and do not wait,
For God might say, "Too late, too late,"
And let his presence shine within
A soul polluted with its sin.

O! wretched, waiting soul!
Lift up your pleading, prayerful voice,
Ask God's forgiveness, Oh, rejoice!
That he will look down from above,
And fill it with redeeming love.

O! breaking, bleeding soul!
Pray God, that he, for Jesus' sake,
Your weak and sinful soul will take,
And purify it with his love,
That it may find a home above.

Contributions.

PASSOVER OR SUPPER.

E. K. TEETER.

What is it and why? To discuss these points, it will be necessary, at this time, to make some preliminaries.

One of our learned contributors to the BRETHREN EVANGELIST makes the following statement: "Jesus Christ did not make use of ambiguous language in delivering the Gospel of salvation." Admitting this to be true, it is nevertheless a fact that the *writers* of the Gospels were fallible men, and they certainly varied enough in the expression of some facts and incidents which they related, to leave room for different views pertaining to what they say on some points, but enough is taught as a whole, for man's salvation.

Rev. Charles A. Briggs D.D. in World's Congress of Religions, page 98 says:

"Higher criticism recognizes faults in grammar, rhetoric and logic, in Hebrew and Greek scriptures." "Most of the scriptures composed, passed through the hands of a considerable number of unknown editors." "What evidence have we that these unknown editors were kept from errors in all their work; all that we can claim is inspiration and accuracy for that which suggests the religious doctrines to be imparted."

God is true, and the Gospel as a whole is also true, and explicit enough on all the essential doctrines for Christian practice and man's salvation. But we dare not, in all instances depend on isolated passages

for the full and correct meaning of the scriptures. If space would permit, I could quote quite a number of instances to prove this, but as I think this is generally understood, I will only add a few instances in their place. The fact that Christ himself did not use "inexplicable," or inaccurate language does not prove that the writers of the Gospels were also infallible, lest there would not be that difference between Matthew, Mark and Luke about the malefactors, and pertaining to the communion, Luke would not have said, this cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for *you*. Whereas, Matthew and Mark say it was shed for *many*. But as Matthew and Mark agree, it is easy understood that Luke only failed to express the same in full. We also find that the writers of the Gospels made many confessions which are filled by words in italics, which are in many instances taken from parallel passages by the translators to fill up the sentences so they may be more readily understood. This proves that the writers were liable to err in the use of written language. By referring to Mark 23: 34, we see that by leaving off the words in italics, which were supplied by the translators, the meaning of the verse could not be understood; so it is in many other instances, but by the general context and comparing parallel passages, the reading may usually be readily understood, but gives rise to difference of views. However difficult some isolated sentences may be, so much as is essential to salvation is always within the comprehension of every honest seeker after truth, of common understanding and unprejudiced mind. Now I will say, that, although the claim that Christ ate the Passover with his disciples on the night in which he was betrayed, is a controverted point, I am satisfied that the Gospel sustains the claim, whether it be said by some that this Passover served the double purpose of a Passover and the Lord's supper or not, it can be proved that it was a Passover, that it was the last and only Passover that was kept, or even could be from that time.

Christ knew what was to come and what he would do. Therefore he said: "Go into the city to such a man and say to him, the Master says my time is at hand, *I will keep the Passover* at thy house with my disciples." Matt. 26: 18. And according to Mark 14: 14, he says: "Where I shall eat the Passover with my disciples." So also Luke 22: 11. Shall we believe it? Who will dare deny it? Not I. The fact that he declared he would eat it, ought to be enough to satisfy any Christian that Christ did eat the Passover. But there is more proof yet for them that have any doubts. After they had made ready

the Passover, he was sitting at meat with the twelve disciples, and as they were eating, etc. Matt. 26: 19, 20. Mark 14: 10. Now, "He said unto them, with desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer, for I shall eat of it no more till it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." Luke 22: 16. This is the correct translation of the quotation, according to American Bible Union and German, also King James or common version. Now then, I may ask did he desire to do what he knew he should not and would not do? That would be most unreasonable. And why not eat of it any more? Because the "time was at hand for its fulfillment." The *Paska* was a type of Christ, and according to the law of Moses, the paschal lamb was sacrificed on the fourteenth day of the month Abib, in the evening at the going down of the sun. Ex. 12. Just a few hours less than twenty-four hours after eating this Passover with the disciples, and just a few minutes after three o'clock on the fourteenth, Christ expired on the cross. The Passover was now fulfilled in "the kingdom of God." The great sacrifice was made, the type met the antetype, and "Christ, our Passover, was sacrificed for us." I Cor. 5: 7. This was the end of the law and of the *Paska*. "Christ blotting out the hand writing or ordinances etc., nailing it on the cross." This was on the preparation day, which was always on the fourteenth, and at the end of this day, after six o'clock the Jews ate what is usually called the Jewish Passover, but it was no more lawful, the time having expired.

Hence we see that Jesus Christ with the disciples, ate the lawful Passover on the first hours of the fourteenth of the month, a short time after six o'clock in the evening, and not on the thirteenth as has been said by a writer. This was necessary as the time did not admit of eating this Passover at the regular time on the first hours of the fifteenth of the month, and Christ truly had authority to make that variation that he might be ready for the *Paska*, when he himself should be the *Paska*. When the "Lamb of God should take away the sin of the world."

What I have now said about the Passover would naturally bring up the question of the Lord's supper. How, when and where instituted? Two of our contributors, who have recently written on this topic in connection with the Passover differ some in their views, and on consideration of what I have written, you would conclude that I differ some with both of them. As it is, I will not write on the question of the Lord's supper now, nor soon after this time, unless I get information that it is desired.